

the particular judges to whom they allegedly "contribute."

In Baltimore City there is one particular evil that I will point out to you, and that is that you can buy nomination in the Republican primaries any day of the week, and that is exactly what happens wherever you have a weak two-party system. It is very easy to take a dollar bill and get yourself a nitch in the general election, and the Baltimore City lawyers who are here, know this.

THE CHAIRMAN: For what purpose does Delegate Malkus rise?

DELEGATE MALKUS: Will the delegate yield for a question?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Gallagher, will you yield?

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: I will be delighted to yield to Delegate Malkus if we can split—half of it on my time, and half on his.

THE CHAIRMAN: You have only five seconds.

DELEGATE GALLAGHER: The question is on my time, and the answer on his.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have to save it.

Delegate Johnson.

DELEGATE JOHNSON: I would like to reserve five minutes to close when we reach the final nine minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mudd.

DELEGATE MUDD: I would like to yield two minutes to Delegate Marion.

DELEGATE MARION: Mr. Chairman, if Delegate Blair had told you all the results of the poll in Missouri of which he spoke, he would have told you also that the great majority of lawyers in the State of Missouri endorse the plan that we proposed for Maryland, and many more endorse it now than endorsed it in 1940. He would have told you that the percentage of lawyers who endorsed it in The City of St. Louis and in the county in which Kansas City is located endorsed it overwhelmingly, because those are the areas at the trial court level where the plan has been in operation for twenty-seven years in the State of Missouri.

And Delegate Dorsey was correct in telling you that the members of the General Assembly of Maryland failed to enact an

amendment which would have provided judicial reform for the State of Maryland. Let us look back and see what happened in the State of Missouri some twenty-seven years ago. The State Bar Association there in 1939 recommended this plan to the Missouri legislature. Not a single opposing witness showed up and appeared before the legislature, but the legislature failed to enact a proposed constitutional amendment. The citizens of Missouri became aroused and they provided by collection far more than the necessary signatures required, enough signatures to put on referendum by the process of constitutional initiative the plan which became known as the Missouri plan. It went on the ballot in 1940 and was approved by the citizens by over 8,000 votes. The legislature was furious. They adopted a constitutional amendment which went on the ballot two years later, which in the past would have had the effect of repealing the prior constitutional amendment.

May I ask for another minute, Your Honor?

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mudd will have to grant it to you.

Delegate Mudd grants you another minute.

DELEGATE MARION: So by act of the legislature the Missouri Plan went before the voters in 1942 and in that year the people of Missouri doubled the margin of victory and rejected the amendment proposed at that time which would have repealed the amendment that they had enacted in 1940.

Then three years after that the State of Missouri adopted a new constitution. At that time they wrote into the constitution the Missouri plan, which had been in effect since 1940; and witnesses before our Committee have told us that that judicial reform in Missouri contained in their new constitution was one of the significant factors in leading to the passage of that new constitution in Missouri in 1945.

That is the record. It ought to be persuasive to Maryland in 1967.

THE CHAIRMAN: Delegate Mudd.

DELEGATE MUDD: I would like to yield two minutes to Delegate Cicone.

DELEGATE CICONE: Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen: I believe the minority report is very inconsistent. Why would they approve a plan that would be